

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected independent claim 42 as being anticipated by Turcanu. However, the Examiner overstates Turcanu. This reference does not teach what the Examiner asserts that it does, and therefore, does not anticipate claim 42.

In more detail, claim 42 is directed to a push-to-talk (PTT) controller configured to establish a local ad hoc group session between an inviting mobile terminal and one or more other mobile terminals located within a specified local area of the inviting mobile terminal. A presence server is configured to identify a group of mobile terminals within a local area of an inviting mobile terminal. From this identified group, a group server creates an ad-hoc group of mobile terminals. A push-to-talk server can then establish a communication session between the mobile terminals in the ad hoc group and the inviting mobile terminal.

Note that the presence server in claim 42 identifies those mobile terminals that are within a specified local area of an inviting mobile terminal. This identification serves a particular purpose in the claimed invention - it allows a group server to establish an *ad hoc* communications session between the inviting mobile terminal and one or more of those specified (i.e., identified) mobile terminals, even though the inviting mobile terminal may not know the identities of those mobile terminals. This aspect differentiates the claimed invention from Turcanu.

More particularly, Turcanu discloses that a presence server may track and store the geographical locations of User Terminals (UTs) as they travel through the network. Turcanu also discloses the ability to establish *ad hoc* communication sessions between UTs. However, Turcanu simply acknowledges that these functions exist. Turcanu never discloses a presence server that identifies UTs within a specified local area of an inviting UT so that a group server can use those identities to establish an *ad hoc* communication session between the inviting mobile terminal and one or more of the identified mobile terminals. The only reason the

Turcanu presence server maintains location information is so that it can disseminate presence summary information to the UTs. *Turcanu*, p. 3, ¶[0034]. According to Turcanu, this provides a user with a tool for maintaining and managing contact information within groups. *Turcanu*, p. 3, ¶[0032]. That is, via client software running on the UT, a user's phone book, for example, can be kept up-to-date with information about other group members. *Turcanu*, p. 3, ¶[0034].

Turcanu does not teach a presence server that identifies one or more local mobile terminals that are within a local area of an inviting mobile terminal. Rather, the Turcanu presence server merely tracks UT locations. And, because Turcanu does not disclose a presence server that identifies those mobile terminals, Turcanu cannot disclose a group server that creates an ad-hoc group for a local ad-hoc group session that includes the inviting mobile terminal and one or more of the identified local mobile terminals. Accordingly, Turcanu does not anticipate claim 1 or any of its dependent claims.

The Examiner also rejected claim 55 as being anticipated by Turcanu. Claim 55 is directed to a method of establishing a local ad hoc group session in a wireless network between an inviting mobile terminal and one or more local mobile terminals. Claim 55 recites identifying one or more local mobile terminals that are within a local area of an inviting mobile terminal, and creating an ad-hoc group for a local ad-hoc group session that includes the inviting mobile terminal and one or more of the identified local mobile terminals. For reasons similar to those stated above, Turcanu does not disclose either of these elements of claim 55. Therefore, Turcanu does not anticipate claim 55 or any of its dependent claims.

The Examiner also rejected claim 64 as being anticipated by Turcanu. Claim 64 is directed to a push-to-talk controller in a wireless network that establishes a push-to-talk communication session for a local ad hoc group comprising an inviting mobile terminal and local mobile terminals. Claim 64 contains language similar to that of claim 42. As such, Turcanu


does not anticipate claim 64 or any of its dependent claims for reasons similar to those stated above.

Additionally, however, Turcanu does not anticipate claim 64 for another reason. Particularly, Turcanu does not disclose a group server that creates an ad-hoc group for a local ad-hoc group session, wherein the ad hoc group includes the inviting mobile terminal and the local mobile terminals within the local area of the inviting mobile terminal that are capable of communicating a specified type of media. Further, the Examiner never alleges that Turcanu does disclose this aspect of claim 64. Therefore, Turcanu does not anticipate claim 64, or any of its dependent claims, for this additional reason.

In light of the foregoing remarks, all new claims are patentable over the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant requests allowance of all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

COATS & BENNETT, P.L.L.C.



Stephen A. Herrera
Registration No.: 47,642

Dated: September 19, 2008

1400 Crescent Green, Suite 300
Cary, NC 27518
Telephone: (919) 854-1844
Facsimile: (919) 854-2084